

REMARKS

Claims 3, 5, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 23, 26, 29, 37, 42, and 47 have been cancelled.

Claim 1 has been amended for purposes of patentability.

Claims 11, 14, 17, 20 and 33 have been amended to correct dependency following the cancellation of claims 7 and 13.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20-22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30-36, 38-41, 43-46 and 48-55 are now before the Examiner. For the reasons that follow, Applicants believe all claims are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has suggested that the status of the related applications be updated. Applicants believe the amendment to the first paragraph of the specification has accomplished this. The Examiner also indicated that the Abstract did not reflect the claimed invention. Applicants believe the amended Abstract better reflects the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 21, 24, 27 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Isaachsen (U.S. Patent No. 1,693,786).

Applicants submit that Isaachsen is non-analogous art and, therefore, does not reasonably form a basis for rejection of the current claims that are directed to slurry loop reactors (i.e., vessels in which a reaction is occurring).

Applicants further submit that the amendment, which incorporates the lower leg limitation of cancelled claim 3 into independent claim 1, places the application in condition for allowance. The apparatus of Isaachsen does not teach or suggest that the curved discharge conduit be located in a lower leg of the loop reactor (see particularly Fig. 2 of Isaachsen, in which the discharge conduit is clearly positioned in a descending leg).

Additionally, with regard to claim 50, applicants submit that there is no teaching in Isaachsen that the opening (e) is located where the overall concentration of solids is higher. Page 2, lines 4-10 of Isaachsen state that only smaller crystals will be present at opening (e) because the coarser crystals will be forced to the wall by centrifugal force. The overall concentration of solids (i.e., the crystals - regardless of size) in the "slurry" disclosed by Isaachsen may actually be higher near the wall, where the coarser crystals are located. There is no indication of where the higher solids concentration would be located.

Claims 35, 40 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaachsen (U.S. Patent No. 1,693,786).


Applicants submit that Isaachsen is non-analogous art and, therefore, does not reasonably form a basis for rejection of the current claims that are directed to slurry loop reactors (i.e., vessels in which a reaction is occurring).

Applicants further submit that the amendment, which incorporates the lower leg limitation of cancelled claim 3 into independent claim 1 (and, therefore, into claims 35, 40 and 45, each of which are dependent from claim 1), places the application in condition for allowance. The apparatus of Isaachsen does not teach or suggest that the curved discharge conduit be located in a lower leg of the loop reactor (see particularly Fig. 2 of Isaachsen, in which the discharge conduit is clearly positioned in a descending leg).

All of the Examiner's rejections have been addressed. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and favorable action is requested. Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney if there are any issues outstanding which have not been presented to the Examiner's satisfaction.

Respectfully submitted,

23 November 2004  
Date

  
Maria C. Walsh  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 37,958

**ExxonMobil Chemical Company**  
Law Technology  
P.O. Box 2149  
Baytown Texas 77522-2149  
Phone: 281-834-1076  
Fax: 281-834-2495